arXiv:1303.2828v1 [math.LO] 12 Mar 2013

MAXIMAL CHAINS OF ISOMORPHIC SUBORDERS OF COUNTABLE ULTRAHOMOGENEOUS PARTIAL ORDERS

Miloš S. Kurilić[1] **and Boriša Kuzeljević**[2]

Abstract

We investigate the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\cup\{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$, where $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ is the set of isomorphic suborders of a countable ultrahomogeneous partial order $\mathbb{X}$. For $\mathbb{X}$ different from (resp. equal to) a countable antichain the order types of maximal chains in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ are characterized as the order types of compact (resp. compact and nowhere dense) sets of reals having the minimum non-isolated.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 06A06, 06A05, 03C15, 03C50.
Keywords: ultrahomogeneous partial order, isomorphic substructure, maximal chain, compact set.

1 Introduction

The general concept - to explore the relationship between the properties of a relational structure $\mathbb{X}$ and the properties of the poset $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ of its isomorphic substructures - can be developed in several ways. For example, regarding the forcing theoretic aspect, the poset of copies of each countable non-scattered linear order is forcing equivalent to the two-step iteration of the Sacks forcing and a σ-closed forcing [9], while the posets of copies of countable scattered linear orders have σ-closed forcing equivalents (separative quotients) [10].

Regarding the order-theoretic aspect, one of extensively investigated order invariants of a poset is the class of order types of its maximal chains [2, 5, 6, 11] and, for the poset of isomorphic suborders of the rational line, $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle$, this class is characterized in [8]. The main result of the present paper is the following generalization of that result.

Theorem 1.1 If $\mathbb{X}$ is a countable ultrahomogeneous partial order different from a countable antichain, then for each linear order L the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) L is isomorphic to a maximal chain in the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$;

(b) L is an $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order with 0_L non-isolated;

(c) L is isomorphic to a compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $0_K \in K'$.

If $\mathbb{X}$ is a countable antichain, then the corresponding characterization is obtained if we replace "complete" by "Boolean" in (b) and "compact" by "compact and nowhere dense" in (c).

---

[1] Department of Mathematics and Informatics, University of Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 4, 21000 Novi Sad, Serbia. e-mail: milos@dmi.uns.ac.rs

[2] Mathematical Institute of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Kneza Mihaila 36, 11001 Belgrade, Serbia. e-mail: borisa@mi.sanu.ac.rs

So, for example, there are maximal chains of copies of the random poset isomorphic to $(0,1]$, to the Cantor set without 0, and to α^*, for each countable limit ordinal α. Although it is not a usual practice, we start with a proof in the introduction. The equivalence of (b) and (c) is a known fact (see, for example, Theorem 6 of [8]) and the implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) follows from the general result on ultrahomogeneous structures given in Theorem 2.2 of the present paper. Thus, only the implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) remains to be proved. Naturally, we will use the following, well known classification of countable ultrahomogeneous partial orders - the Schmerl list [13]:

Theorem 1.2 (Schmerl) A countable strict partial order is ultrahomogeneous iff it is isomorphic to one of the following partial orders:

$\mathbb{A}_\omega$, a countable antichain (that is, the empty relation on ω);

$\mathbb{B}_n = n \times \mathbb{Q}$, for $1 \leq n \leq \omega$, where $\langle i_1, q_1 \rangle < \langle i_2, q_2 \rangle \Leftrightarrow i_1 = i_2 \wedge q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2$;

$\mathbb{C}_n = n \times \mathbb{Q}$, for $1 \leq n \leq \omega$, where $\langle i_1, q_1 \rangle < \langle i_2, q_2 \rangle \Leftrightarrow q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2$;

$\mathbb{D}$, the unique countable homogeneous universal poset (the random poset).

For the antichain $\mathbb{A}_\omega$ the implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) follows from Theorem 1.4 and the fact that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{A}_\omega) = [\omega]^\omega$ is a positive family. The most difficult part of the proof of (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) - for the random poset $\mathbb{D}$ - is given in Section 4. In Sections 5 and 6, using the constructions from [8], we prove (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) for the posets $\mathbb{B}_n$ and $\mathbb{C}_n$.

The rest of this section contains two facts which will be used in the sequel. We remind the reader that a linear order $\langle L, < \rangle$ is called *Boolean* iff it is *complete* (has 0,1 and has no gaps) and *has dense jumps*, which means that for each $x, y \in L$ satisfying $x < y$ there are $a, b \in L$ such that $x \leq a < b \leq y$ and $(a,b)_L = \emptyset$.

Fact 1.3 Each countable complete linear order is Boolean.

We recall that a family $\mathcal{P} \subset P(\omega)$ is called a *positive family* iff:

(P1) $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{P}$;

(P2) $\mathcal{P} \ni A \subset B \subset \omega \Rightarrow B \in \mathcal{P}$;

(P3) $A \in \mathcal{P} \wedge |F| < \omega \Rightarrow A \setminus F \in \mathcal{P}$;

(P4) $\exists A \in \mathcal{P} \ \ |\omega \setminus A| = \omega$.

Theorem 1.4 ([7]) If $\mathcal{P} \subset P(\omega)$ is a positive family, then for each linear order L the following conditions are equivalent:

(a) L is isomorphic to a maximal chain in the poset $\langle \mathcal{P} \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$;

(b) L is an $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable Boolean linear order with 0_L non-isolated;

(c) L is isomorphic to a compact nowhere dense set $K \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that $0_K \in K'$.

In addition, (b) implies that there is a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\langle \mathcal{P} \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ satisfying $\bigcap(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}) = \emptyset$ and isomorphic to L.

2 Copies of countable ultrahomogeneous structures

Let $L = \{R_i : i \in I\}$ be a relational language, where $\mathrm{ar}(R_i) = n_i$, $i \in I$. An L-structure $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \{\rho_i : i \in I\}\rangle$ is called *countable* iff $|X| = \omega$. If $A \subset X$, then $\langle A, \{(\rho_i)_A : i \in I\}\rangle$ (shortly denoted by $\langle A, \{\rho_i : i \in I\}\rangle$, whenever this abuse of notation does not produce a confusion) is a *substructure* of $\mathbb{X}$, where $(\rho_i)_A = \rho_i \cap A^{n_i}$, $i \in I$. If $\mathbb{Y} = \langle Y, \{\sigma_i : i \in I\}\rangle$ is an L-structure too, a mapping $f : X \to Y$ is an *embedding* (we write $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{Y}$) iff it is an injection and

$$\forall i \in I \;\; \forall \langle x_1, \dots x_{n_i}\rangle \in X^{n_i} \;\; (\langle x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}\rangle \in \rho_i \Leftrightarrow \langle f(x_1), \dots, f(x_{n_i})\rangle \in \sigma_i).$$

If $\mathbb{X}$ embeds in $\mathbb{Y}$ we write $\mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Y}$. Let $\mathrm{Emb}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{Y}) = \{f : \mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{Y}\}$ and $\mathrm{Emb}(\mathbb{X}) = \{f : \mathbb{X} \hookrightarrow_f \mathbb{X}\}$. If, in addition, f is a surjection, it is an *isomorphism* (we write $\mathbb{X} \cong_f \mathbb{Y}$) and the structures $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ are *isomorphic*, in notation $\mathbb{X} \cong \mathbb{Y}$.

A *finite isomorphism* of $\mathbb{X}$ is each isomorphism between finite substructures of $\mathbb{X}$. A structure $\mathbb{X}$ is *ultrahomogeneous* iff each finite isomorphism on $\mathbb{X}$ can be extended to an automorphism of $\mathbb{X}$. The *age* of $\mathbb{X}$, $\mathrm{Age}\, \mathbb{X}$, is the class of all finite L-structures embeddable in $\mathbb{X}$. We will use the following well known facts from the Fraïssé theory.

Theorem 2.1 (Fraïssé) Let L be an at most countable relational language. Then

(a) A countable L-structure $\mathbb{X}$ is ultrahomogeneous iff for each finite isomorphism φ of $\mathbb{X}$ and each $x \in X \setminus \mathrm{dom}\, \varphi$ there is a finite isomorphism ψ of $\mathbb{X}$ extending φ to x (see [3] p. 389 or [4] p. 326).

(b) If $\mathbb{X}$ and $\mathbb{Y}$ are countable ultrahomogeneous L-structures and $\mathrm{Age}\, \mathbb{X} = \mathrm{Age}\, \mathbb{Y}$, then $\mathbb{X} \cong \mathbb{Y}$ (see [3] p. 333 or [4] p. 326).

Concerning the order types of maximal chains in the posets of the form $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset\rangle$, where $\mathbb{X} = \langle X, \{\rho_i : i \in I\}\rangle$ is a relational structure and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ the set of the domains of its isomorphic substructures, that is

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) = \{A \subset X : \langle A, \{(\rho_i)_A : i \in I\}\rangle \cong \mathbb{X}\} = \{f[X] : f \in \mathrm{Emb}(\mathbb{X})\}$$

we have the following general statement.

Theorem 2.2 Let $\mathbb{X}$ be a countable ultrahomogeneous structure of an at most countable relational language and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \neq \{X\}$. If $\mathcal{L}$ is a maximal chain in the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$, then

(a) $\mathcal{L}$ is an $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order with $0_{\mathcal{L}} (= \emptyset)$ non-isolated;

(b) If there is a positive family $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, then for each countable linear order L satisfying (a), there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. (a) First we prove that

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \text{ for each chain } \mathcal{A} \text{ in the poset } \langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X}), \subset\rangle. \tag{1}$$

Let φ be a finite isomorphism of $\bigcup\mathcal{A}$ and $x\in\bigcup\mathcal{A}$. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is a chain there is $A\in\mathcal{A}$ such that $\operatorname{dom}\varphi\cup\operatorname{ran}\varphi\cup\{x\}\subset A$. Since $A\cong\mathbb{X}$, by Theorem 2.1(a) there is $y\in A$ such that $\psi=\varphi\cup\{\langle x,y\rangle\}$ is an isomorphism so ψ is a finite isomorphism of $\bigcup\mathcal{A}$. Thus, by Theorem 2.1(a), the structure $\bigcup\mathcal{A}$ is ultrahomogeneous. Since $\mathbb{X}\cong A\subset\bigcup\mathcal{A}\subset X$ we have $\operatorname{Age}\mathbb{X}=\operatorname{Age}A\subset\operatorname{Age}\bigcup\mathcal{A}\subset\operatorname{Age}\mathbb{X}$, which, by Theorem 2.1(b), implies $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\cong\mathbb{X}$, that is $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$.

Let $X=\{x_n:n\in\omega\}$ be an enumeration. Since $\mathcal{L}\subset[X]^\omega\cup\{\emptyset\}$, the function $f:\mathcal{L}\to\mathbb{R}$ defined by $f(A)=\sum_{n\in\omega}2^{-n}\cdot\chi_A(x_n)$ (where $\chi_A:X\to\{0,1\}$ is the characteristic function of the set $A\subset X$) is an embedding of $\langle\mathcal{L},\subset\rangle$ into $\langle\mathbb{R},<_{\mathbb{R}}\rangle$.

Clearly, $\min\mathcal{L}=\emptyset$ and $\max\mathcal{L}=X$. Let $\langle\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}\rangle$ be a cut in $\mathcal{L}$. If $\mathcal{A}=\{\emptyset\}$ then $\max\mathcal{A}=\emptyset$. If $\mathcal{A}\neq\{\emptyset\}$, by (1) we have $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$ and, since $A\subset\bigcup\mathcal{A}\subset B$, for each $A\in\mathcal{A}$ and $B\in\mathcal{B}$, the maximality of $\mathcal{L}$ implies $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\in\mathcal{L}$. So, if $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\in\mathcal{A}$ then $\max\mathcal{A}=\bigcup\mathcal{A}$. Otherwise $\bigcup\mathcal{A}\in\mathcal{B}$ and $\min\mathcal{B}=\bigcup\mathcal{A}$. Thus $\langle\mathcal{L},\subset\rangle$ is complete.

Suppose that A is the successor of $\emptyset$ in $\mathcal{L}$. Since $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\neq\{X\}$ there is $B\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\setminus\{X\}$ and, if $f:\mathbb{X}\hookrightarrow A$, then $f[B]\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$, $f[B]\subsetneq A$ and, hence, $\mathcal{L}\cup\{f[B]\}$ is a chain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})$. A contradiction to the maximality of $\mathcal{L}$.

(b) By Fact 1.3, L is a Boolean order and, by Theorem 1.4, in the poset $\langle\mathcal{P}\cup\{\emptyset\},\subset\rangle$ there is a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ isomorphic to L and such that $\bigcap(\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\})=\emptyset$. Now, $\mathcal{L}$ is a chain in $\langle\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\cup\{\emptyset\},\subset\rangle$ and we check its maximality. Suppose that $\mathcal{L}\cup\{A\}$ is a chain, where $A\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\setminus\mathcal{L}$. Then $A\subsetneq S$ or $S\subsetneq A$, for each $S\in\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\}$ and, since $\bigcap(\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\})=\emptyset$, there is $S\in\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\}$ such that $S\subset A$, which implies $A\in\mathcal{P}$. But $\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\}$ is a maximal chain in $\mathcal{P}$. A contradiction. □

Remark 2.3 Concerning the assumption $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\neq\{X\}$ we note that there are countable ultrahomogeneous structures satisfying $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})=\{X\}$ (see [3], p. 399).

For $1<n<\omega$ the set $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n)$ does not contain a positive family, since (P3) is not satisfied. Namely, if $A\in\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n)$ and $x\in A$, then $A\setminus\{x\}$ is not a copy of $\mathbb{C}_n$ (one class of incompatible elements is of size $n-1$).

For some ω-saturated, ω-homogeneous-universal relational structures the implication (b) ⇒ (a) of Theorem 1.1 is not true. Let L be the language with one binary relational symbol ρ and $\mathcal{T}$ the L-theory of empty relations ($\forall x,y\ \neg\ x\,\rho\,y$). Then $\mathbb{X}=\langle\omega,\emptyset\rangle$ is the ω-saturated model of $\mathcal{T}$. But $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})=[\omega]^\omega$ is a positive family and, by Theorem 1.4, maximal chains in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\cup\{\emptyset\}$ are Boolean. Thus, for example, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{X})\cup\{\emptyset\}$ does not contain a maximal chain isomorphic to $[0,1]_{\mathbb{R}}$.

3 Copies of the countable random poset

Let $\mathbb{P}=\langle P,<\rangle$ be a partial order. By $C(\mathbb{P})$ we denote the set of all triples $\langle L,G,U\rangle$ of pairwise disjoint finite subsets of P such that:

(C1) $\forall l\in L\ \forall g\in G\ \ l<g$,

(C2) $\forall u\in U\ \forall l\in L\ \ \neg u<l$ and

(C3) $\forall u\in U\ \forall g\in G\ \ \neg g<u$.

For $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{P})$, let $P_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$ be the set of all $p \in P\setminus(L\cup G\cup U)$ satisfying:
(S1) $\forall l \in L\ p > l$,
(S2) $\forall g \in G\ p < g$ and
(S3) $\forall u \in U\ p\| u$ (where $p\|q$ denotes that $p \neq q \wedge \neg p < q \wedge \neg q < p$).

Fact 3.1 Let $\mathbb{P} = \langle P, <\rangle$ be a partial order and $\emptyset \neq A \subset P$. Then
(a) $C(A,<) = \{\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{P}) : L,G,U \subset A\}$;
(b) $A_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} = P_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \cap A$, for each $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(A,<)$.
(c) $\langle\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle \in C(\mathbb{P})$ and $P_{\langle\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle} = P$.

Proof. For pairwise disjoint sets $L,G,U \subset A$ we have: $L\times G \subset <$ iff $L\times G \subset <_A$ and $((U\times L)\cup(G\times U))\cap < = \emptyset$ iff $((U\times L)\cup(G\times U))\cap <_A = \emptyset$. □

Fact 3.2 A countable strict partial order $\mathbb{D} = \langle D, <\rangle$ is a countable random poset iff $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \neq \emptyset$, for each $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$ (see [1]).

Lemma 3.3 Let $\mathbb{D} = \langle D, <\rangle$ be a countable random poset. Then
(a) $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$ and, hence, $|D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}| = \omega$, for each $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$;
(b) $D \setminus F \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$, for each finite $F \subset D$;
(c) If $D = A \,\dot\cup\, B$, then either A or B contains an element of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$;
(d) If $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$ is a chain, then $\bigcup\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$;
(e) If $C \subset D$ and $A \not\subset C$ for each $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$, then $D\setminus C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$.

Proof. (a) Let $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$. Then L, G and U are disjoint subsets of D,

$$\forall l \in L\ \ \forall g \in G\ \ \forall u \in U\ \ (u \not< l < g \not< u), \tag{2}$$

and $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \cap (L\cup G\cup U) = \emptyset$. Let $\langle L_1,G_1,U_1\rangle \in C(D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle})$. Then L_1, G_1 and U_1 are disjoint subsets of $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$ and, by Fact 3.1, $\langle L_1,G_1,U_1\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$ which implies

$$\forall l_1 \in L_1\ \ \forall g_1 \in G_1\ \ \forall u_1 \in U_1\ \ (u_1 \not< l_1 < g_1 \not< u_1). \tag{3}$$

Since $L_1\cup G_1\cup U_1 \subset D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$, by (S1)-(S3) we have

$$\forall x \in L_1\cup G_1\cup U_1\ \ \forall l \in L\ \ \forall g \in G\ \ \forall u \in U\ \ (l < x < g \wedge x \not< u \wedge u \not< x). \tag{4}$$

First we show that $\langle L\cup L_1, G\cup G_1, U\cup U_1\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$. (C1) Let $l' \in L\cup L_1$ and $g' \in G\cup G_1$. Then $l' < g'$ follows from: (2), if $l' \in L$ and $g' \in G$; (3), if $l' \in L_1$ and $g' \in G_1$; (4), if $l' \in L$ and $g' = x \in G_1$ or $l' = x \in L_1$ and $g' \in G$. (C2) Let $l' \in L\cup L_1$ and $u' \in U\cup U_1$. Then $u' \not< l'$ follows from: (2), if $l' \in L$ and $u' \in U$; (3), if $l' \in L_1$ and $u' \in U_1$; (4), if $l' \in L$ and $u' = x \in U_1$ (since $l' < u'$) or $l' = x \in L_1$ and $u' \in U$. In the same way we prove (C3).

So there is $x \in D_{\langle L\cup L_1, G\cup G_1, U\cup U_1\rangle}$, which implies $x \in D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \cap D_{\langle L_1,G_1,U_1\rangle} = (D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle})_{\langle L_1,G_1,U_1\rangle}$ (Fact 3.1). Thus $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$ is a random poset and, hence a copy of $\mathbb{D}$.

(b) Let $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(D\setminus F)$. By Fact 3.1 we have $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$ and, by (a), $\emptyset \neq (D\setminus F)\cap D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} = (D\setminus F)_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$. Thus $D\setminus F$ is a copy of $\mathbb{D}$.

(c) Suppose that $P(A)\cap \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) = \emptyset$. Then $A \notin \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$ and, hence, there is $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(A)$ such that $A_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} = D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}\cap A = \emptyset$. By Fact 3.1 we have $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$ and, by (a), $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) \ni D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \subset B$.

(d) See (1) in the proof of Theorem 2.2.

(e) Let $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(D\setminus C)$. Then, by Fact 3.1, $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(\mathbb{D})$ and, by (a), $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$. By the assumption we have $D_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}\cap (D\setminus C) \neq \emptyset$ and, by Fact 3.1, $(D\setminus C)_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \neq \emptyset$ and $D\setminus C$ is a random poset. $\Box$

Lemma 3.4 Let $\mathbb{D} = \langle D, <\rangle$ be a countable random poset, $C \in [D]^\omega$ and $A \not\subset C$ for each $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$ (for example, C can be an infinite antichain). Then

(a) $\mathcal{P} = \{B \subset D : D\setminus C \subset^* B\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$;

(b) $\mathcal{P}$ is a positive family on D.

Proof. (a) Suppose that $A \subset D\setminus B$, for some $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$. Since $D\setminus C \subset^* B$ we have $D\setminus B \subset^* C$ and, hence, $A \subset^* C$, that is $|A\setminus C| < \omega$. By Lemma 3.3(b), $A\cap C = A\setminus (A\setminus C) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$, which is not true. So $D\setminus B$ does not contain copies of $\mathbb{D}$ and, by Lemma 3.3(e), $B \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$.

(b) Conditions (P1) and (P2) are evident. If $D\setminus C \subset^* B$ and $|F| < \omega$, then, clearly, $D\setminus C \subset^* B\setminus F$ and (P3) is true. Since the set $D\setminus C$ is co-infinite (P4) is true as well. $\Box$

Lemma 3.5 Let $A \subset B \subset \omega$ and let L be a complete linear ordering, such that $|B\setminus A| = |L| - 1$. Then there is a chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $[A,B]_{P(B)}$ satisfying $A, B \in \mathcal{L} \cong L$ and such that $\bigcup\mathcal{A}, \bigcap\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}$ and $|\bigcap\mathcal{B}\setminus\bigcup\mathcal{A}| \leq 1$, for each cut $\langle\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}\rangle$ in $\mathcal{L}$.

Proof. If $|B\setminus A|$ is a finite set, say $B = A\cup\{a_1,\dots a_n\}$, then $|L| = n+1$ and $\mathcal{L} = \{A, A\cup\{a_1\}, A\cup\{a_1,a_2\},\dots,B\}$ is a chain with the desired properties.

If $|B\setminus A| = \omega$, then L is a countable and, hence, $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order. It is known that an infinite linear order is isomorphic to a maximal chain in $P(\omega)$ iff it is $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable and Boolean (see, for example, [7]). By Fact 1.4 L is a Boolean order and, thus, there is a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}_1$ in $P(B\setminus A)$ isomorphic to L. Let $\mathcal{L} = \{A\cup C : C \in \mathcal{L}_1\}$. Since $\emptyset, B\setminus A \in \mathcal{L}_1$ we have $A, B \in \mathcal{L}$ and the function $f : \mathcal{L}_1 \to \mathcal{L}$, defined by $f(C) = A\cup C$, witnesses that $\langle\mathcal{L}_1, \subsetneq\rangle \cong \langle\mathcal{L}, \subsetneq\rangle$ so $\mathcal{L}$ is isomorphic to L. For each cut $\langle\mathcal{A},\mathcal{B}\rangle$ in $\mathcal{L}_1$ we have $\bigcup\mathcal{A} \subset \bigcap\mathcal{B}$ and, by the maximality of $\mathcal{L}_1$, $\bigcup\mathcal{A}, \bigcap\mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}_1$ and $|\bigcap\mathcal{B}\setminus\bigcup\mathcal{A}| \leq 1$. Clearly, the same is true for each cut in $\mathcal{L}$. $\Box$

4 Maximal chains of copies of the random poset

Theorem 4.1 For each $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order L with 0_L non-isolated there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})\cup\{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. By Lemma 3.4 and Theorem 2.2 it remains to prove the statement for uncountable L's. So let L be an uncountable linear order with the given properties.

Claim 4.2 $L \cong \sum_{x\in[-\infty,\infty]} L_x$, where

(L1) L_x, $x \in [-\infty,\infty]$, are at most countable complete linear orders,

(L2) The set $M = \{x \in [-\infty,\infty] : |L_x| > 1\}$ is at most countable,

(L3) $|L_{-\infty}| = 1$ or $0_{L_{-\infty}}$ is non-isolated.

Proof. $L = \sum_{i\in I} L_i$, where L_i are the equivalence classes corresponding to the condensation relation $\sim$ on L given by: $x \sim y \Leftrightarrow |[\min\{x,y\},\max\{x,y\}]| \leq \omega$ (see [12]). Since L is complete and $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable I is too and, since the cofinalities and coinitialities of L_i's are countable, I is a dense linear order; so $I \cong [0,1] \cong [-\infty,\infty]$. Hence L_i's are complete and, since $\min L_i \sim \max L_i$, countable. If $|L_i| > 1$, L_i has a jump (Fact 1.3) so, $L \hookrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ gives $|M| \leq \omega$. $\Box$

Case I: $-\infty \notin M \ni \infty$. First we take the rational line $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle$ and construct a set $\lhd \subset \mathbb{Q}^2$ such that $\langle \mathbb{Q}, \lhd\rangle$ is a random poset with additional, convenient properties. Let $\mathbb{P}$ be the set of pairs $p = \langle P_p, \lhd_p\rangle$ satisfying

(i) $P_p \in [\mathbb{Q}]^{<\omega}$,

(ii) $\lhd_p \subset P_p \times P_p$ is a strict partial order on P_p,

(iii) $<_{\mathbb{Q}}$ extends $\lhd_p$, that is $\forall q_1, q_2 \in P_p \ \ (q_1 \lhd_p q_2 \Rightarrow q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2)$,

and let the relation $\leq$ on $\mathbb{P}$ be defined by:

$$p \leq q \Leftrightarrow P_p \supset P_q \wedge \lhd_p \cap (P_q \times P_q) = \lhd_q \, . \tag{5}$$

Claim 4.3 $\langle \mathbb{P}, \leq\rangle$ is a partial order.

Proof. The reflexivity of $\leq$ is obvious. If $p \leq q \leq p$, then $P_p = P_q$ and, hence, $\lhd_p = \lhd_p \cap (P_p \times P_p) = \lhd_p \cap (P_q \times P_q) = \lhd_q$ so $p = q$ and $\leq$ is antisymmetric.

If $p \leq q \leq r$, then $P_p \supset P_q \supset P_r$ and, consequently, $\lhd_p \cap (P_r \times P_r) = \lhd_p \cap (P_q \times P_q) \cap (P_r \times P_r) = \lhd_q \cap (P_r \times P_r) = \lhd_r$. Thus $p \leq r$. $\Box$

Claim 4.4 The sets $\mathcal{D}_q = \{p \in \mathbb{P} : q \in P_p\}$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, are dense in $\mathbb{P}$.

Proof. If $p \in \mathbb{P} \setminus \mathcal{D}_q$, that is $q \notin P_p$, then $\lhd_p$ is an irreflexive and transitive relation on the set P_p and on the set $P_p \cup \{q\}$ as well. Also $\lhd_p \subset <_{\mathbb{Q}}$ thus $p_1 = \langle P_p \cup \{q\}, \lhd_p\rangle \in \mathbb{P}$. Thus $p_1 \in \mathcal{D}_q$ and, clearly, $p_1 \leq p$. $\Box$

Let $\mathbb{Q} = J \cup \bigcup_{y\in M} J_y$ be a partition of $\mathbb{Q}$ into $|M| + 1$ dense subsets of $\mathbb{Q}$. For $\langle L, G, U\rangle \in ([\mathbb{Q}]^{<\omega})^3 \setminus \{\langle \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle\}$, let $m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} = \max_{\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle}(L \cup G \cup U)$.

Claim 4.5 For each $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in ([\mathbb{Q}]^{<\omega})^3 \setminus \{\langle\emptyset,\emptyset,\emptyset\rangle\}$ and each $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the set $\mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$ is dense in $\mathbb{P}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m} \;=\; & \Big\{p\in\mathbb{P} : L\cup G\cup U \subset P_p \;\wedge\; \Big(\langle L,G,U\rangle \not\in C(p)\\ & \vee\; (G\neq\emptyset \wedge p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}\cap J\neq\emptyset)\\ & \vee\; (G=\emptyset \wedge p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}\cap (m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}, m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}+\tfrac{1}{m})\cap J\neq\emptyset)\Big)\Big\}.\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $p' \in \mathbb{P}\setminus\mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$. By Claim 4.4 there is $p\in\mathbb{P}$ such that $p\leq p'$ and $L\cup G\cup P\subset P_p$. If $\langle L,G,U\rangle\not\in C(p)$ then $p\in\mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$ and we are done. If

$$\langle L,G,U\rangle\in C(p), \tag{6}$$

then we continue the proof distinguishing the following two cases.

Case 1: $G\neq\emptyset$. Let us define $\max_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle}\emptyset=-\infty$. By (6) and (C1) for p, if $L\neq\emptyset$, then $\max_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} L \lhd_p \min_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} G$ and, by (iii), $\max_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} L <_\mathbb{Q} \min_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} G$. Now, since J is a dense set in $\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle$ we choose

$$q\in(\max_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} L, \min_{\langle\mathbb{Q},<_\mathbb{Q}\rangle} G)\cap J\setminus P_p \tag{7}$$

and define $p_1=\langle P_p\cup\{q\},\lhd_{p_1}\rangle$ where

$$\lhd_{p_1}=\lhd_p\cup\{\langle x,q\rangle : \exists l\in L\;\; x\trianglelefteq_p l\}\cup\{\langle q,y\rangle : \exists g\in G\;\; g\trianglelefteq_p y\}. \tag{8}$$

First we prove that $p_1\in\mathbb{P}$. Clearly, p_1 satisfies condition (i).

(ii) Since $\lhd_p$ is an irreflexive relation and, by (7), $q\not\in P_p$, by (8) the relation $\lhd_{p_1}$ is irreflexive as well.

Suppose that $\lhd_{p_1}$ is not asymmetric. Then, since $\lhd_p$ is asymmetric, there is $t\in P_p$ such that $\langle t,q\rangle,\langle q,t\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$ and by (8), $g\trianglelefteq_p t\trianglelefteq_p l$, for some $l\in L$ and $g\in G$ which, by the transitivity of $\trianglelefteq_p$ implies $g\trianglelefteq_p l$. But, by (6) and (C1) we have $l\lhd_p g$. A contradiction.

Let $\langle a,b\rangle,\langle b,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$. Then, since the relation $\lhd_{p_1}$ is irreflexive and asymmetric, we have $a\neq b\neq c\neq a$. If $q\not\in\{a,b,c\}$, then $\langle a,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$ by the transitivity of $\lhd_p$. Otherwise we have three possibilities:

$a=q$. Then $\langle b,c\rangle\in\lhd_p$ and there is $g\in G$ such that $g\trianglelefteq_p b$. Hence $g\lhd_p c$ which, by (8), implies $\langle q,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$, that is $\langle a,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$.

$b=q$. Then there are $l\in L$ and $g\in G$ such that $a\trianglelefteq_p l$ and $g\trianglelefteq_p c$. By (C1) we have $l\lhd_p g$ and, by the transitivity of $\lhd_p$, $a\lhd_p c$ and, hence, $\langle a,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$.

$c=q$. Then $\langle a,b\rangle\in\lhd_p$ and there is $l\in L$ such that $b\trianglelefteq_p l$. Hence $a\lhd_p l$ which, by (8), implies $\langle a,q\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$, that is $\langle a,c\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$.

(iii) Since $p\in\mathbb{P}$, we have $\lhd_p\subset<_\mathbb{Q}$. If $\langle x,q\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$ and $l\in L$, where $x\trianglelefteq_p l$, then, since $\lhd_p$ satisfies (iii), we have $x\leq_\mathbb{Q} l$. By (7) we have $l<_\mathbb{Q} q$ and, thus, $x<_\mathbb{Q} q$. In a similar way we show that $\langle q,y\rangle\in\lhd_{p_1}$ implies $q<_\mathbb{Q} y$.

Thus $p_1\in\mathbb{P}$, $P_{p_1}\supset P_p\supset L\cup G\cup U$ and, by (8), $\lhd_{p_1}\cap(P_p\times P_p)=\lhd_p$, which implies that $p_1\leq p$ $(\leq p')$. So p is a suborder of p_1 and, by (6) and Fact

3.1, $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(p_1)$. Since $G \neq \emptyset$ and $q \in J$, for a proof that $p_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$ it remains to be shown that $q \in (p_1)_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$. By (8) $l \lhd_{p_1} q \lhd_{p_1} g$, for each $l \in L$ and $g \in G$, so (S1) and (S2) are true. For $u \in U$, $\langle u,q\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ would give $l \in L$ satisfying $u \unlhd_p l$ and, since $U \cap L = \emptyset$, $u \lhd_p l$, which is impossible by (6) and (C2). Similarly, $\langle q,u\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ is not possible and, thus, $q \parallel_{p_1} u$ and (S3) is satisfied.

Case 2: $G = \emptyset$. Again, since J is a dense set in the linear order $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle$ we choose

$$q \in (m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}, m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} + \tfrac{1}{m}) \cap J \setminus P_p \tag{9}$$

and define $p_1 = \langle P_p \cup \{q\}, \lhd_{p_1}\rangle$, where

$$\lhd_{p_1} = \lhd_p \cup \{\langle x,q\rangle : \exists l \in L \;\; x \unlhd_p l\}. \tag{10}$$

First we prove that $p_1 \in \mathbb{P}$. Clearly, p_1 satisfies condition (i).

(ii) By (9) we have $q \notin P_p$ so, by (10) the relation $\lhd_{p_1}$ is irreflexive.

Let $\langle a,b\rangle, \langle b,c\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$. If $q \notin \{a,b,c\}$, then $\langle a,c\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ by (10) and the transitivity of $\lhd_p$. Otherwise, by (10) again, $a,b \neq q$ and, thus, $c = q$. Hence there is $l \in L$ such that $b \unlhd_p l$. Since $a,b \neq q$, by (10) we have $a \lhd_p b$ and, hence $a \lhd_p l$, which implies $\langle a,q\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$, that is $\langle a,c\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$.

(iii) Since $p \in \mathbb{P}$, we have $\lhd_p \subset <_{\mathbb{Q}}$. If $\langle x,q\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ and $l \in L$, where $x \unlhd_p l$, then, since $\lhd_p$ satisfies (iii), we have $x \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} l$. By (9) we have $l \leq_{\mathbb{Q}} m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} <_{\mathbb{Q}} q$ and, thus, $x <_{\mathbb{Q}} q$.

Thus $p_1 \in \mathbb{P}$. As in Case 1 we show that $L \cup G \cup U \subset P_{p_1}$, $p_1 \leq p \; (\leq p')$ and $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in C(p_1)$. By (9) and since $G = \emptyset$, for a proof that $p_1 \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$ it remains to be shown that $q \in (p_1)_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$. (S2) is trivial and, by (10), for $l \in L$ we have $\langle l,q\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ thus (S1) holds as well. Suppose that $\neg\, q \parallel_{p_1} u$, for some $u \in U$. Then, by (9) and (10), $\langle u,q\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ and, hence, there is $l \in L$ satisfying $u \lhd_p l$, which is impossible by (6) and (C2) for p. So (S3) is true. $\Box$

By the Rasiowa Sikorski theorem there is a filter $\mathcal{G}$ in $\langle \mathbb{P}, \leq\rangle$ intersecting the sets $\mathcal{D}_q$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, and $\mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$, $\langle L,G,U\rangle \in ([\mathbb{Q}]^{<\omega})^3$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Claim 4.6 (a) $\bigcup_{p\in\mathcal{G}} P_p = \mathbb{Q}$;

(b) $\lhd = \bigcup_{p\in\mathcal{G}} \lhd_p$ is a strict partial order on $\mathbb{Q}$;

(c) $\lhd \cap (P_p \times P_p) = \lhd_p$, for each $p \in \mathcal{G}$;

(d) $<_{\mathbb{Q}}$ extends $\lhd$, that is $\forall q_1,q_2 \in \mathbb{Q}\; (q_1 \lhd q_2 \Rightarrow q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2)$.

Proof. (a) For $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ let $p_0 \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}_q$. Then $q \in P_{p_0} \subset \bigcup_{p\in\mathcal{G}} P_p$.

(b) The relation $\lhd$ is irreflexive since all the relations $\lhd_p$ are irreflexive.

Let $\langle a,b\rangle, \langle b,c\rangle \in \lhd$, $\langle a,b\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ and $\langle b,c\rangle \in \lhd_{p_2}$, where $p_1,p_2 \in \mathcal{G}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ is a filter there is $p \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $p \leq p_1,p_2$, which by (5) implies $\lhd_{p_1}, \lhd_{p_2} \subset \lhd_p$. Thus $\langle a,b\rangle, \langle b,c\rangle \in \lhd_p$ and, by the transitivity of $\lhd_p$, $\langle a,c\rangle \in \lhd_p \subset \lhd$.

(c) The inclusion "$\supset$" follows from (ii) and the definition of $\lhd$. If $\langle a,b\rangle \in \lhd \cap (P_p \times P_p)$, then there is $p_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\langle a,b\rangle \in \lhd_{p_1}$ and, since $\mathcal{G}$ is a filter, there is $p_2 \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $p_2 \leq p,p_1$. By (5) we have $\lhd_{p_1} \subset \lhd_{p_2}$, which implies $\langle a,b\rangle \in \lhd_{p_2}$ and, by (5) again, $\langle a,b\rangle \in \lhd_{p_2} \cap (P_p \times P_p) = \lhd_p$.

(d) If $\langle q_1, q_2\rangle \in \lhd$ and $p \in \mathcal{G}$ where $\langle q_1, q_2\rangle \in \lhd_p$, then by (iii), $q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2$. $\Box$

Claim 4.7 (a) $\langle A, \lhd\rangle$ is a random poset, for each $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ and each set A satisfying

$$(-\infty, x) \cap J \subset A \subset (-\infty, x) \cap \mathbb{Q} \tag{11}$$

(b) If $J \subset A \subset \mathbb{Q}$ then $\langle A, \lhd\rangle$ (in particular, $\langle \mathbb{Q}, \lhd\rangle$) is a random poset.

(c) If $C \subset \mathbb{Q}$ and $\max_{\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle} C$ exists, then $\langle C, \lhd\rangle$ is not a random poset.

Proof. (a) By Claim 4.6(b), $\langle A, \lhd\rangle$ is a strict partial order. Let $\langle L, G, U\rangle \in C(A, \lhd)$. Then

$$L \cup G \cup U \subset A \;\;\wedge\;\; L \cap G = G \cap U = U \cap A = \emptyset, \tag{12}$$

$$\forall l \in L \;\; \forall g \in G \;\; \forall u \in U \;\; (\langle l, g\rangle \in \lhd \;\wedge\; \langle u, l\rangle \notin \lhd \;\wedge\; \langle g, u\rangle \notin \lhd). \tag{13}$$

We show that $\langle A, \lhd\rangle_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \neq \emptyset$. For $\langle L, G, U\rangle \neq \langle \emptyset, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle$ we have two cases.

Case 1: $G \neq \emptyset$. Let $p \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,1}$. Then

$$L \cup G \cup U \subset P_p. \tag{14}$$

First we show that $\langle L, G, U\rangle \in C(p)$. Let $l \in L$, $g \in G$ and $u \in U$. By (13), (14) and Claim 4.6(c) we have $\langle l, g\rangle \in \lhd_p$ and (C1) is true. Since $\lhd_p \subset \lhd$ by (13) we have $\langle u, l\rangle \notin \lhd_p$ and $\langle g, u\rangle \notin \lhd_p$ and (C2) and (C3) are true as well.

Since $p \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,1}$ there is $q \in p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \cap J$. We prove that $q \in \langle A, \lhd\rangle_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$. For a $g \in G$ we have $q \lhd_p g$ and, by (iii), $q <_{\mathbb{Q}} g$. By (11) and (12) we have $g \in G \subset A \subset (-\infty, x)$ and, hence $q <_{\mathbb{Q}} g <_{\mathbb{R}} x$, thus $q \in (-\infty, x) \cap J \subset A$. Let $l \in L$, $g \in G$ and $u \in U$. Since $q \in p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$ we have $l \lhd_p q \lhd_p g$ and $\lhd_p \subset \lhd$ implies $l \lhd q \lhd g$. Thus (S1) and (S2) are true. Suppose that $\neg\; q \parallel_{\langle A, \lhd\rangle} u$. Since $q \notin U$ we have $q \neq u$ and, hence, $q \lhd u$ or $u \lhd q$. But then, since $u, q \in P_p$, by Claim 4.6(c) we would have $q \lhd_p u$ or $u \lhd_p q$, which is impossible because $q \in p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$. So (S3) is true as well.

Case 2: $G = \emptyset$. By (11) and (12) we have $L \cup G \cup U \subset (-\infty, x)$, which implies $m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} < x$ and, hence, there is $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} + \tfrac{1}{m} < x. \tag{15}$$

Let $p \in \mathcal{G} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$. Then (14) holds again and exactly like in Case 1 we show that $\langle L, G, U\rangle \in C(p)$. Thus, since $p \in \mathcal{D}_{\langle L,G,U\rangle,m}$ there is $q \in p_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} \cap (m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}, m_{\langle L,G,U\rangle} + \frac{1}{m}) \cap J$ and, by (15), $q \in J \cap (-\infty, x)$. Thus, by (11), $q \in A$ and exactly like in Case 1 we prove that $q \in \langle A, \lhd\rangle_{\langle L,G,U\rangle}$.

(b) Follows from (a) for $x = \infty$.

(c) Suppose that $\max_{\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}\rangle} C = q$ and that $\langle C, \lhd\rangle$ is a random poset. Then $C_{\langle \{q\}, \emptyset, \emptyset\rangle} \neq \emptyset$ and, by (S1), there is $q_1 \in C$ such that $q \lhd q_1$, which, by Claim 4.6(d) implies $q <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_1$. A contradiction with the maximality of q. $\Box$

For $y \in M$ let us take $I_y \in [J_y \cap (-\infty, y))]^{|L_y|-1}$ and define $A_{-\infty} = \emptyset$ and

$$A_x = (J \cap (-\infty, x)) \cup \textstyle\bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x)} I_y, \quad \text{for } x \in (-\infty, \infty];$$

$$A_x^+ = A_x \cup I_x, \quad \text{for } x \in M.$$

Since $J \subset A_\infty^+ \subset \mathbb{Q}$, by Claim 4.7(b) $\langle A_\infty^+, \lhd \rangle$ is a random poset and we construct a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+, \lhd), \subset \rangle$, such that $\mathcal{L} \cong L$.

Claim 4.8 The sets A_x, $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$ and A_x^+, $x \in M$ are subsets of the set A_∞^+ and of $\mathbb{Q}$. In addition, for each $x, x_1, x_2 \in [-\infty, \infty]$ we have

(a) $A_x \subset (-\infty, x)$;
(b) $A_x^+ \subset (-\infty, x)$, if $x \in M$;
(c) $x_1 < x_2 \Rightarrow A_{x_1} \varsubsetneq A_{x_2}$;
(d) $M \ni x_1 < x_2 \Rightarrow A_{x_1}^+ \varsubsetneq A_{x_2}$;
(e) $|A_x^+ \setminus A_x| = |L_x| - 1$, if $x \in M$;
(f) $A_x \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$, for each $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$.
(g) $A_x^+ \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$ and $[A_x, A_x^+]_{\mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)} = [A_x, A_x^+]_{P(A_x^+)}$, for each $x \in M$.

Proof. Statements (c) and (d) are true since J is a dense subset of $\mathbb{Q}$; (a), (b) and (e) follow from the definitions of A_x and A_x^+ and the choice of the sets I_y. Since $J \cap (-\infty, x) \subset A_x \subset A_x^+ \subset (-\infty, x) \cap \mathbb{Q}$, (f) and (g) follow from Claim 4.7(a). □

Now, for $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$ we define chains $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ in the following way.

For $x \notin M$ we define $\mathcal{L}_x = \{A_x\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty} = \{\emptyset\}$.

For $x \in M$, using Claim 4.8 and Lemma 3.5 we obtain a set $\mathcal{L}_x \subset [A_x, A_x^+]_{P(A_x^+)}$ such that $\langle \mathcal{L}_x, \varsubsetneq \rangle \cong \langle L_x, <_x \rangle$ and

$$A_x, A_x^+ \in \mathcal{L}_x \subset [A_x, A_x^+]_{\mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)}, \tag{16}$$

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A}, \bigcap \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}_x \quad \text{and} \quad |\bigcap \mathcal{B} \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{A}| \leq 1, \text{ for each cut } \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \rangle \text{ in } \mathcal{L}_x. \tag{17}$$

For $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$ we will write $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$ iff $A \varsubsetneq B$, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Claim 4.9 Let $\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} \mathcal{L}_x$. Then

(a) If $-\infty \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq \infty$, then $\mathcal{L}_{x_1} \prec \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$ and $\bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_1} \subset A_{x_2} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$.
(b) $\mathcal{L}$ is a chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to $L = \sum_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} L_x$.
(c) $\mathcal{L}$ is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$.

Proof. (a) Let $A \in \mathcal{L}_{x_1}$ and $B \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$. If $x_1 \in (-\infty, \infty] \setminus M$, then, by (16) and Claim 4.8(c) we have $A = A_{x_1} \varsubsetneq A_{x_2} \subset B$. If $x_1 \in M$, then, by (16) and Claim 4.8(d), $A \subset A_{x_1}^+ \varsubsetneq A_{x_2} \subset B$. The second statement follows from $A_{x_2} \in \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$.

(b) By (a), $\langle [-\infty, \infty], < \rangle \cong \langle \{\mathcal{L}_x : x \in [-\infty, \infty]\}, \prec \rangle$. Since $\mathcal{L}_x \cong L_x$, for $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$, we have $\langle \mathcal{L}, \varsubsetneq \rangle \cong \sum_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} \langle \mathcal{L}_x, \varsubsetneq \rangle \cong \sum_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} L_x = L$.

(c) Suppose that $C \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ witnesses that $\mathcal{L}$ is not maximal. Clearly $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} \dot{\cup} \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$, where $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in \mathcal{L} : A \varsubsetneq C\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \mathcal{L} : C \varsubsetneq B\}$. Now $\emptyset \in \mathcal{L}_{-\infty}$ and, since $\infty \in M$, by (16) we have $A_\infty^+ \in \mathcal{L}_\infty$. Thus $\emptyset, A_\infty^+ \in \mathcal{L}$, which implies $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ and, hence, $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \rangle$ is a cut in $\langle \mathcal{L}, \varsubsetneq \rangle$. By (16) we have $\{A_x : x \in (-\infty,\infty]\} \subset \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ and, by Claim 4.8(a), $\bigcap(\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}) \subset \bigcap_{x\in(-\infty,\infty]} A_x \subset \bigcap_{x\in(-\infty,\infty]}(-\infty,x) = \emptyset$, which implies $\mathcal{A} \neq \{\emptyset\}$. Clearly,

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A} \subset C \subset \bigcap \mathcal{B}. \tag{18}$$

Case 1: $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \neq \emptyset$, for some $x_0 \in (-\infty,\infty]$. Then $|\mathcal{L}_{x_0}| > 1$, $x_0 \in M$ and $\langle \mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0}, \mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \rangle$ is a cut in $\mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ satisfying (17). By (a), $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x<x_0} \mathcal{L}_x \cup (\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0})$ and, consequently, $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \bigcup(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0}) \in \mathcal{L}$. Similarly, $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \bigcap(\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0}) \in \mathcal{L}$ and, since $|\bigcap \mathcal{B} \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{A}| \leq 1$, by (18) we have $C \in \mathcal{L}$. A contradiction.

Case 2: $\neg$ Case 1. Then for each $x \in (-\infty,\infty]$ we have $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{B}$. Since $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{A} \,\dot{\cup}\, \mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{A} \neq \{\emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$, the sets $\mathcal{A}' = \{x \in (-\infty,\infty] : \mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}' = \{x \in (-\infty,\infty] : \mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{B}\}$ are non-empty and $(-\infty,\infty] = \mathcal{A}' \,\dot{\cup}\, \mathcal{B}'$. Since $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$, for $x_1 \in \mathcal{A}'$ and $x_2 \in \mathcal{B}'$ we have $\mathcal{L}_{x_1} \prec \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$ so, by (a), $x_1 < x_2$. Thus $\langle \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' \rangle$ is a cut in $(-\infty,\infty]$ and, consequently, there is $x_0 \in (-\infty,\infty]$ such that $x_0 = \max \mathcal{A}'$ or $x_0 = \min \mathcal{B}'$.

Subcase 2.1: $x_0 = \max \mathcal{A}'$. Then $x_0 < \infty$ because $\mathcal{B} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x \leq x_0} \mathcal{L}_x$ so, by (a), $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x\leq x_0} \bigcup \mathcal{L}_x = \bigcup_{x<x_0} \bigcup \mathcal{L}_x \cup \bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_0} = \bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_0}$ which, together with (16) implies

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \begin{cases} A_{x_0} & \text{if } x_0 \notin M, \\ A^+_{x_0} & \text{if } x_0 \in M. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

Since $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{x\in(x_0,\infty]} \mathcal{L}_x$, we have $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \bigcap_{x\in(x_0,\infty]} \bigcap \mathcal{L}_x$. By (16) $\bigcap \mathcal{L}_x = A_x$, so we have $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = (\bigcap_{x\in(x_0,\infty]}(-\infty,x) \cap J) \cup (\bigcap_{x\in(x_0,\infty]} \bigcup_{y\in M\cap(-\infty,x)} I_y) = ((-\infty,x_0] \cap J) \cup \bigcup_{y\in M\cap(-\infty,x_0]} I_y = A_{x_0} \cup (\{x_0\} \cap J) \cup \bigcup_{y\in M\cap\{x_0\}} I_y$, so

$$\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \begin{cases} A_{x_0} & \text{if } \; x_0 \notin J \;\; \wedge \;\; x_0 \notin M, \\ A_{x_0} \cup \{x_0\} & \text{if } \; x_0 \in J \;\; \wedge \;\; x_0 \notin M, \\ A^+_{x_0} & \text{if } \; x_0 \notin J \;\; \wedge \;\; x_0 \in M, \\ A^+_{x_0} \cup \{x_0\} & \text{if } \; x_0 \in J \;\; \wedge \;\; x_0 \in M. \end{cases} \tag{20}$$

If $x_0 \notin J$, then, by (18), (19) and (20), we have $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \bigcap \mathcal{B} = C \in \mathcal{L}$. A contradiction.

If $x_0 \in J$ and $x_0 \notin M$, then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = A_{x_0}$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0} \cup \{x_0\}$. So, by (18) and since $C \notin \mathcal{L}$ we have $C = \bigcap \mathcal{B}$. But, by Claim 4.8(a), $x_0 = \max \bigcap \mathcal{B}$ so, by Claim 4.7(c), $C \notin \mathbb{P}(A^+_\infty)$. A contradiction.

If $x_0 \in J$ and $x_0 \in M$, then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = A^+_{x_0}$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A^+_{x_0} \cup \{x_0\}$. Again, by (18) and since $C \notin \mathcal{L}$ we have $C = \bigcap \mathcal{B}$. By Claim 4.8(b), $x_0 = \max \bigcap \mathcal{B}$ so, by Claim 4.7(c), $C \notin \mathbb{P}(A^+_\infty)$. A contradiction.

Subcase 2.2: $x_0 = \min \mathcal{B}'$. Then, by (16), $A_{x_0} \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \subset \mathcal{B}$ which, by (a), implies $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0}$. Since $A_x \in \mathcal{L}_x$, for $x \in (-\infty,\infty]$ and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x<x_0} \mathcal{L}_x$ we have $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x<x_0} \bigcup \mathcal{L}_x \supset \bigcup_{x<x_0} A_x = \bigcup_{x<x_0} ((-\infty,x) \cap J) \cup \bigcup_{x<x_0} \bigcup_{y\in M\cap(-\infty,x)} I_y$

$= ((-\infty, x_0) \cap J) \cup \bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x_0)} I_y = A_{x_0}$ so $A_{x_0} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{A} \subset \bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0}$, which implies $C = A_{x_0} \in \mathcal{L}$. A contradiction. $\square$

Case II: $-\infty \not\in M \not\ni \infty$. Then $L_\infty = \{\max L\}$ and the sum $L + 1$ belongs to Case I. So, there are a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ and an isomorphism $f : \langle L + 1, < \rangle \to \langle \mathcal{L}, \subset \rangle$. Then $A = f(\max L) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D})$ and $\mathcal{L}' = f[L] \cong L$. By the maximality of $\mathcal{L}$, $\mathcal{L}'$ is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$.

Case III: $-\infty \in M$. Then $L = \sum_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} L_x$, (L1) and (L2) of Claim 4.2 hold and

(L3$'$) $L_{-\infty}$ is a countable complete linear order with $0_{L_{-\infty}}$ non-isolated.

Clearly $L = L_{-\infty} + L^+$, where $L^+ = \sum_{x \in (-\infty, \infty]} L_x = \sum_{y \in (0, \infty]} L_{\ln y}$ (here $\ln \infty = \infty$). Let L'_y, $y \in [-\infty, \infty]$, be disjoint linear orders such that $L'_y \cong 1$, for $y \in [-\infty, 0]$, and $L'_y \cong L_{\ln y}$, for $y \in (0, \infty]$. Now $\sum_{y \in [-\infty, \infty]} L'_y \cong [-\infty, 0] + L^+$ belongs to Case I or Case II and we obtain a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and an isomorphism $f : \langle [-\infty, 0] + L^+, < \rangle \to \langle \mathcal{L}, \subset \rangle$. Clearly, for $A_0 = f(0)$ and $\mathcal{L}^+ = f[L^+]$ we have $A_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}^+ \cong L^+$.

By (L3$'$) and the fact that (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) for countable L's, $\mathbb{P}(A_0) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ contains a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty} \cong L_{-\infty}$. Clearly $A_0 \in \mathcal{L}_{-\infty}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty} \cup \mathcal{L}^+ \cong L_{-\infty} + L^+ = L$. Suppose that B witnesses that $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty} \cup \mathcal{L}^+$ is not a maximal chain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$. Then either $A_0 \subsetneq B$, which is impossible since $\mathcal{L}$ is maximal in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$, or $B \subsetneq A_0$, which is impossible since $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty}$ is maximal in $\mathbb{P}(A_0) \cup \{\emptyset\}$. $\square$

5 Maximal chains in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n)$

Theorem 5.1 For $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order L with 0_L non-isolated there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. Let the order on $\mathbb{B}_n = \bigcup_{i<n} \mathbb{Q}_i = \bigcup_{i<n} \{i\} \times \mathbb{Q}$ be given by

$$\langle i_1, q_1 \rangle < \langle i_2, q_2 \rangle \Leftrightarrow i_1 = i_2 \ \wedge \ q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2.$$

Clearly, $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}} \rangle \cong_{f_i} \langle \mathbb{Q}_i, < \rangle$, where $f_i(q) = \langle i, q \rangle$, for all $q \in \mathbb{Q}$ and, hence, $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_i) = \{\{i\} \times C : C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q})\}$. If $f : \mathbb{B}_n \hookrightarrow \mathbb{B}_n$, then for each $i < n$ the restriction $f|\mathbb{Q}_i$ is an isomorphism, thus there is $j_i < n$ such that $f[\mathbb{Q}_i] \subset \mathbb{Q}_{j_i}$ and, moreover, $f[\mathbb{Q}_i] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_{j_i})$. Clearly, $i_1 \neq i_2$ implies $j_{i_1} \neq j_{i_2}$ and, thus, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n) = \{ \textstyle\bigcup_{i<n} \{i\} \times C_i : \forall i < n \ \ C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \}. \tag{21}$$

Now, by Theorem 6 of [8], there is a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to L. For $A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ let

$$A^* = (\{0\} \times A) \cup \textstyle\bigcup_{0<i<n} \{i\} \times \mathbb{Q}. \tag{22}$$

By (21) we have $\mathcal{L}^* = \{A^* : A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}\} \cup \{\emptyset\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and, clearly, $\langle \mathcal{L}^*, \subset \rangle$ is a chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to $\langle \mathcal{L}, \subset \rangle$ and, hence, to L.

Suppose that some $C = \bigcup_{i<n}\{i\} \times C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_n)$ witnesses that $\mathcal{L}^*$ is not a maximal chain. By (21) and (22) $C \subset \bigcap_{A \in \mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\}} A^*$ would imply $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \ni C_0 \subset \bigcap(\mathcal{L}\setminus\{\emptyset\})$, which is impossible ($\mathcal{L}$ is a maximal chain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and $C_0 \setminus F \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q})$ for each finite $F \subset C_0$). Thus there is $A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ such that $A^* \subset C$ and, by (22),

$$C = \{0\} \times C_0 \cup \bigcup_{0<i<n}\{i\} \times \mathbb{Q}. \tag{23}$$

Since $\mathcal{L}^* \cup \{C\}$ is a chain, for each $A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$ we have $A^* \subsetneq C \ \vee \ C \subsetneq A^*$ which together with (22) and (23) implies $A \subsetneq C_0$ or $C_0 \subsetneq A$. A contradiction to the maximality of $\mathcal{L}$. $\square$

Theorem 5.2 For each $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order L with 0_L non-isolated there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. Let $x_0 = \infty$, let $\langle x_n : n \in \mathbb{N} \rangle$ be a descending sequence in $\mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$ without a lower bound and let $\mathbb{B}_\omega = \langle \mathbb{Q}, <_\omega \rangle = \bigcup_{i\in\omega} \langle (x_{i+1}, x_i) \cap \mathbb{Q}, <_i \rangle$ where

$$q_1 <_\omega q_2 \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \omega \ \ (q_1, q_2 \in (x_{i+1}, x_i) \ \wedge \ q_1 <_{\mathbb{Q}} q_2).$$

Then for the sets $\mathbb{Q}_i = (x_{i+1}, x_i) \cap \mathbb{Q}$, $i \in \omega$, we have $\langle \mathbb{Q}_i, <_i \rangle \cong \langle \mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}} \rangle$, which implies $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_i, <_i) \cong \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}})$. As in the proof of Theorem 5.1 we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) = \{\bigcup_{i\in S} C_i : S \in [\omega]^\omega \ \wedge \ \forall i \in S \ \ C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_i)\}. \tag{24}$$

Let L be a linear order with the given properties and, first, let $|L| = \omega$. Clearly the family $\mathrm{Dense}(\mathbb{Q}_i)$ of dense subsets of $\mathbb{Q}_i$ is a subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_i)$ and by (24) we have $\mathcal{P} = \{\bigcup_{i\in\omega} C_i : \forall i \in \omega \ \ C_i \in \mathrm{Dense}(\mathbb{Q}_i)\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega)$. It is easy to check that $\mathcal{P}$ is a positive family on $\mathbb{Q}$ so, by Theorem 2.2(b), there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Now, let $|L| > \omega$. Then, by Claim 4.2, we can assume that $L = \sum_{x\in[-\infty,\infty]} L_x$, where conditions (L1-L3) from Claim 4.2 are satisfied. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1: $-\infty \notin M$. Then, by the construction from [8] (if $(0,1]$ is replaced by $(-\infty, \infty]$ and A_1^+ by $\mathbb{Q}$), there is a maximal chain $\mathcal{L}$ in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ such that

$$\forall A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \ \exists x \in (-\infty, \infty] \ (A \subset (-\infty, x) \ \wedge \ A \text{ is dense in } (-\infty, x)) \tag{25}$$

and $\mathcal{L} \cong L$. Now we prove

$$\mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_{\mathbb{Q}}). \tag{26}$$

Let $A \in \mathcal{L} \setminus \{\emptyset\}$, let x be the real corresponding to A in the sense of (25) and let $i_0 = \min\{i \in \omega : (-\infty, x) \cap (x_{i+1}, x_i) \neq \emptyset\}$. Then $x_{i_0+1} < x \leq x_{i_0}$ and, by (25) the set $C_{i_0} = A \cap (x_{i_0+1}, x)$ is dense in (x_{i_0+1}, x) and, hence, $C_{i_0} \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_{i_0})$. Similarly, $C_i = A \cap (x_{i+1}, x_i) \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}_i)$, for all $i > i_0$. Since $A \subset \mathbb{Q}$, we have $A = \bigcup_{i \geq i_0} C_i$ and, by (24), $A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega)$. So the first inclusion of (26) is proved.

Let $C = \bigcup_{i\in S} C_i \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega)$. By (24) for each $i \in S$ we have $C_i \cong \mathbb{Q}_i \cong \mathbb{Q}$ and, hence, $C \cong \sum_{\omega^*} \mathbb{Q} \cong \mathbb{Q}$. The second inclusion of (26) is proved as well.

By (26) we have $\mathcal{L} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ and, clearly, $\mathcal{L}$ is a chain in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L} \cup \{C\}$ is a chain, for some $C \in (\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}) \setminus \mathcal{L}$. Then, by (26), $C \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q})$ and $\mathcal{L}$ would not be a maximal chain in the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$. So $\mathcal{L}$ is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{B}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ and $\mathcal{L} \cong L$.

Case 2: $-\infty \in M$. Then we proceed as in (III) of the proof of Theorem 4.1. □

6 Maximal chains in $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n)$

Theorem 6.1 For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and each $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order L with 0_L non-isolated there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. Let the order $<$ on $\mathbb{C}_n = \mathbb{Q} \times n$ be given by $\langle q_1, i_1\rangle < \langle q_2, i_2\rangle \Leftrightarrow q_1 <_\mathbb{Q} q_2$. Clearly, the incomparability relation $a \| b \Leftrightarrow a \not< b \ \wedge \ b \not< a$ on $\mathbb{C}_n$ is an equivalence relation with the equivalence classes $\{q\} \times n$, $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, of size n and the corresponding quotient, $\mathbb{C}_n/\|$, is isomorphic to $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}\rangle$. Since each element of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n)$ has such classes we have $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n) = \{A \times n : A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q})\}$. It is easy to see that the mapping $f : \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\} \to \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}$, given by $f(A) = A \times n$, is an isomorphism of partial orders $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ and $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_n) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$. Hence the statement follows from Theorem 6 of [8]. □

Theorem 6.2 For each $\mathbb{R}$-embeddable complete linear order L with 0_L non-isolated there is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_\omega) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset\rangle$ isomorphic to L.

Proof. Let the strict order $<$ on $\mathbb{C}_\omega = \mathbb{Q} \times \omega = \bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} \{q\} \times \omega = \bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} \omega_q$ be given by $\langle q_1, i_1\rangle < \langle q_2, i_2\rangle \Leftrightarrow q_1 <_\mathbb{Q} q_2$. For a set $X \subset \mathbb{C}_\omega$ let us define $\operatorname{supp} X = \{q \in \mathbb{Q} : X \cap \omega_q \neq \emptyset\}$. Now the incomparability classes ω_q are infinite and, again, the corresponding quotient, $\mathbb{C}_\omega/\|$, is isomorphic to the rational line $\langle \mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}\rangle$. Since the same holds for the copies of $\mathbb{C}_\omega$ it is easy to check that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_\omega) = \{\textstyle\bigcup_{q\in A} \{q\} \times C_q : A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{Q}, <_\mathbb{Q}) \ \wedge \ \forall q \in A \ C_q \in [\omega]^\omega\}. \tag{27}$$

$$X \subset \mathbb{C}_\omega \wedge \text{ there is } \max \operatorname{supp} X \Rightarrow X \notin \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_\omega). \tag{28}$$

By (27), $\mathcal{P} = \{\bigcup_{q\in\mathbb{Q}} \{q\} \times C_q : \forall q \in \mathbb{Q} \ C_q \in [\omega]^\omega\} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_\omega)$ and, clearly, $\mathcal{P}$ is a positive family so for a countable L the statement follows from Theorem 2.2(b).

Now, let L be an uncountable linear order. Then, by Claim 4.2, we can assume that $L = \sum_{x\in[-\infty,\infty]} L_x$, where conditions (L1-L3) from Claim 4.2 are satisfied.

Case I: $-\infty \notin M \ni \infty$. Let $\mathbb{Q} = \bigcup_{y\in M} J_y$ be a partition of $\mathbb{Q}$ into $|M|$ disjoint dense sets and, for $y \in M$, let $I_y \in [J_y \cap (-\infty, y)]^{|L_y|-1}$. Let $(-\infty, x)_\mathbb{Q} = (-\infty, x) \cap \mathbb{Q}$ and $\omega^+ = \omega \setminus \{0\}$. Let us define $A_{-\infty} = \emptyset$ and, for $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$,

$$A_x = ((-\infty, x)_\mathbb{Q} \times \omega^+) \cup \textstyle\bigcup_{y\in M\cap(-\infty,x)} I_y \times \{0\},$$

$$A_x^+ = A_x \cup (I_x \times \{0\}), \quad \text{for } x \in M.$$

By (27), $A_\infty^+ \cong \mathbb{C}_\omega$ and we will construct a maximal chain $\mathcal{L} \cong L$ in the poset $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$. By (27), for each $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ and each set $A \subset \mathbb{C}_\omega$ we have

$$(-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+ \subset A \subset (-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega \ \ \Rightarrow \ \ A \in \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{C}_\omega). \tag{29}$$

Claim 6.3 The sets A_x, $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$ and A_x^+, $x \in M$ are subsets of the set A_∞^+. In addition, for each $x, x_1, x_2 \in [-\infty, \infty]$ we have

(a) $A_x \subset (-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega$;
(b) $A_x^+ \subset (-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega$, if $x \in M$;
(c) $x_1 < x_2 \Rightarrow A_{x_1} \varsubsetneq A_{x_2}$;
(d) $M \ni x_1 < x_2 \Rightarrow A_{x_1}^+ \varsubsetneq A_{x_2}$;
(e) $|A_x^+ \setminus A_x| = |L_x| - 1$, if $x \in M$;
(f) $A_x \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$, for each $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$.
(g) $A_x^+ \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$ and $[A_x, A_x^+]_{\mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)} = [A_x, A_x^+]_{P(A_x^+)}$, for each $x \in M$.

Proof. Statements (c) and (d) are true since $\mathbb{Q}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{R}$; (a), (b) and (e) follow from the definitions of A_x and A_x^+ and the choice of the sets I_y. Since $(-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+ \subset A_x \subset A_x^+ \subset (-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega$, (f) and (g) follow from (29). □

Now, for $x \in [-\infty, \infty]$ we define chains $\mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ in the following way.

For $x \notin M$ we define $\mathcal{L}_x = \{A_x\}$. In particular, $\mathcal{L}_{-\infty} = \{\emptyset\}$.

For $x \in M$, by Claim 6.3 and Lemma 3.5 there is a set $\mathcal{L}_x \subset [A_x, A_x^+]_{P(A_x^+)}$ such that $\langle \mathcal{L}_x, \varsubsetneq \rangle \cong \langle L_x, <_x \rangle$ and

$$A_x, A_x^+ \in \mathcal{L}_x \subset [A_x, A_x^+]_{\mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)}, \tag{30}$$

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A}, \bigcap \mathcal{B} \in \mathcal{L}_x \quad \text{and} \quad |\bigcap \mathcal{B} \setminus \bigcup \mathcal{A}| \leq 1, \text{ for each cut } \langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \rangle \text{ in } \mathcal{L}_x. \tag{31}$$

For $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+)$ we will write $\mathcal{A} \prec \mathcal{B}$ iff $A \varsubsetneq B$, for each $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$.

Claim 6.4 Let $\mathcal{L} = \bigcup_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} \mathcal{L}_x$. Then

(a) If $-\infty \leq x_1 < x_2 \leq \infty$, then $\mathcal{L}_{x_1} \prec \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$ and $\bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_1} \subset A_{x_2} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{L}_{x_2}$.
(b) $\mathcal{L}$ is a chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$ isomorphic to $L = \sum_{x \in [-\infty, \infty]} L_x$.
(c) $\mathcal{L}$ is a maximal chain in $\langle \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}, \subset \rangle$.

Proof. The proof of (a) and (b) is a copy of the proof of (a) and (b) of Claim 4.9, if we replace (16) and Claim 4.8 by (30) and Claim 6.3.

(c) Suppose that $C \in \mathbb{P}(A_\infty^+) \cup \{\emptyset\}$ witnesses that $\mathcal{L}$ is not maximal. Using (30) and Claim 6.3, as in the proof of Claim 4.9(c) for $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in \mathcal{L} : A \varsubsetneq C\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B \in \mathcal{L} : C \varsubsetneq B\}$ we show that $\langle \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \rangle$ is a cut in $\langle \mathcal{L}, \varsubsetneq \rangle$, $\mathcal{A} \neq \{\emptyset\}$ and

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A} \subset C \subset \bigcap \mathcal{B}. \tag{32}$$

Case 1: $\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \neq \emptyset$, for some $x_0 \in (-\infty, \infty]$. Then we obtain a contradiction exactly like in Claim 4.9.

Case 2: $\neg$ Case 1. Then like in Claim 4.9 for $\mathcal{A}' = \{x \in (-\infty, \infty] : \mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{A}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}' = \{x \in (-\infty, \infty] : \mathcal{L}_x \subset \mathcal{B}\}$ we show that $\langle \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}' \rangle$ is a cut in $(-\infty, \infty]$. Thus, there is $x_0 \in (-\infty, \infty]$ such that $x_0 = \max \mathcal{A}'$ or $x_0 = \min \mathcal{B}'$.

Subcase 2.1: $x_0 = \max \mathcal{A}'$. Then like in Claim 4.9 we prove

$$\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \begin{cases} A_{x_0} & \text{if } x_0 \notin M, \\ A^+_{x_0} & \text{if } x_0 \in M. \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

Since $\mathcal{B} = \bigcup_{x \in (x_0, \infty]} \mathcal{L}_x$, we have $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \bigcap_{x \in (x_0, \infty]} \bigcap \mathcal{L}_x$. By (30) $\bigcap \mathcal{L}_x = A_x$, so $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = (\bigcap_{x \in (x_0, \infty]} (-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+) \cup (\bigcap_{x \in (x_0, \infty]} \bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x)} I_y \times \{0\}) = ((-\infty, x_0]_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+) \cup \bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x_0]} I_y \times \{0\} = A_{x_0} \cup ((\{x_0\} \cap \mathbb{Q}) \times \omega^+) \cup \bigcup_{y \in M \cap \{x_0\}} I_y \times \{0\}$, so

$$\bigcap \mathcal{B} = \begin{cases} A_{x_0} & \text{if} \quad x_0 \notin \mathbb{Q} \quad \wedge \quad x_0 \notin M, \\ A_{x_0} \cup (\{x_0\} \times \omega^+) & \text{if} \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{Q} \quad \wedge \quad x_0 \notin M, \\ A^+_{x_0} & \text{if} \quad x_0 \notin \mathbb{Q} \quad \wedge \quad x_0 \in M, \\ A^+_{x_0} \cup (\{x_0\} \times \omega^+) & \text{if} \quad x_0 \in \mathbb{Q} \quad \wedge \quad x_0 \in M. \end{cases} \tag{34}$$

If $x_0 \notin \mathbb{Q}$, then, by (32-34), we have $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = \bigcap \mathcal{B} = C \in \mathcal{L}$. A contradiction.

If $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x_0 \notin M$, then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = A_{x_0}$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0} \cup (\{x_0\} \times \omega^+)$. So, by (32) and since $C \notin \mathcal{L}$ we have $C = A_{x_0} \cup S$, where $\emptyset \neq S \subset \{x_0\} \times \omega^+$. By Claim 6.3(a), $x_0 = \max \operatorname{supp} C$ so, by (28), $C \notin \mathbb{P}(A^+_\infty)$. A contradiction.

If $x_0 \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $x_0 \in M$, then $\bigcup \mathcal{A} = A^+_{x_0}$ and $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A^+_{x_0} \cup (\{x_0\} \times \omega^+)$. Again, by (32) and since $C \notin \mathcal{L}$ we have $C = A_{x_0} \cup S$, where $\emptyset \neq S \subset \{x_0\} \times \omega^+$. By Claim 6.3(b), $x_0 = \max \operatorname{supp} C$ so, by (28), $C \notin \mathbb{P}(A^+_\infty)$. A contradiction.

Subcase 2.2: $x_0 = \min \mathcal{B}'$. Then, by (30), $A_{x_0} \in \mathcal{L}_{x_0} \subset \mathcal{B}$ which, by (a), implies $\bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0}$. Since $A_x \in \mathcal{L}_x$, for all $x \in (-\infty, \infty]$ and $\mathcal{A} = \bigcup_{x < x_0} \mathcal{L}_x$ we have $\bigcup \mathcal{A} \supset \bigcup_{x < x_0} A_x = \bigcup_{x < x_0} ((-\infty, x)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+) \cup \bigcup_{x < x_0} \bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x)} I_y \times \{0\} = ((-\infty, x_0)_{\mathbb{Q}} \times \omega^+) \cup \bigcup_{y \in M \cap (-\infty, x_0)} I_y \times \{0\} = A_{x_0}$ so $A_{x_0} \subset \bigcup \mathcal{A} \subset \bigcap \mathcal{B} = A_{x_0}$, which implies $C = A_{x_0} \in \mathcal{L}$. A contradiction. □

Case II: $-\infty \notin M \not\ni \infty$ or $-\infty \in M$. Then we proceed like in Claim 4.9. □

References

[1] P. J. Cameron, D. C. Lockett, Posets, homomorphisms and homogeneity, Discrete Math. 310,3 (2010) 604–613.

[2] G. W. Day, Maximal chains in atomic Boolean algebras, Fund. Math. 67 (1970) 293-296.

[3] R. Fraïssé, Theory of relations, Revised edition, With an appendix by Norbert Sauer, Studies in Logic and the Foundations of Mathematics, 145, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2000.

[4] W. Hodges, Model theory, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 42, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993.

[5] S. Koppelberg, Maximal chains in interval algebras, Algebra Univers. 27,1 (1990) 32-43.

[6] K. Kuratowski, Sur la notion de l'ordre dans la théorie des ensembles, Fund. Math. 2 (1921) 161–171.

[7] M. S. Kurilić, Maximal chains in positive subfamilies of $P(\omega)$, Order, 29,1 (2012) 119–129.

[8] M. S. Kurilić, Maximal chains of copies of the rational line, Order, in print, DOI 10.1007/s11083-012-9273-1

[9] M. S. Kurilić, S. Todorčević, Forcing by non-scattered sets, Ann. Pure Appl. Logic 163 (2012) 1299–1308.

[10] M. S. Kurilić, Posets of copies of countable scattered linear orders, submitted.

[11] J. D. Monk, Towers and maximal chains in Boolean algebras, Algebra Univers. 56,3-4 (2007) 337–347.

[12] J. G. Rosenstein, Linear orderings, Pure and Applied Mathematics, 98, Academic Press Inc., New York-London, 1982.

[13] J. H. Schmerl, Countable homogeneous partially ordered sets, Algebra Univers. 9,3 (1979) 317-321.